

BL 2727  
.M4  
Copy 1

---

HOSTIS HUMANI GENERIS.  
INGERSOLL AT THE BARRICADES.

4 B 2  
[Copyright, 1886.]

BY *abdyette* L. MARTIN.

*of Wilmington, Ill.*

---

Kankakee Gazette Book Office.





BL 21  
M 4

HOSTIS HUMANI GENERIS.

---

## INGERSOLL AT THE BARRICADES.

---

"Man is bad enough with religion; he would be far worse without it; therefore do not unchain the tiger."—*Dr. Franklin's Letter to Tom Paine.*

---

"If there were such a place as heaven and I went there, and I found a God, I would commence immediately throwing up barricades. I would hoist the red flag, I would rebel."—*Bergeret, Communist.*

---

In all discussions it is common to assume that there is a God. In all times, in all climes, men have, with rare exceptions, believed in the existence of a power or powers superior to man. They have believed that somehow this power had some thing to do with creating all worlds and all things that exist, and exercises more or less control over the affairs of these worlds, and that in some special sense cares for men, and is interested in all their works and ways.

The idea so universal that there is a God or gods, may be all a fallacy, a mistake. That which we call Creation may be no creation at all, but the result of chance or accident. Perhaps this chance or accident is the only controlling power in the universe. Perhaps the world does not need any *real* God, can get along, it may be, without any. All these are questions that I do not presume to decide upon. "They are too high for me."

But whether there is a *real* God or only an imaginary one, all candid minds will admit that the *belief* in a Supreme Power, and our relations to such power, have in all ages exercised a great influence upon human beings.

An atheist says: "Men made laws to govern the world, but they saw that much evil was committed that could never be brought to light. To correct this they *feigned* an All-Seeing God, who should be a witness to what might occur in darkness and the secret chambers of the breast, and a Judge who could bring men to account beyond the grave."

This is fair, intelligent, candid. The idea is that the wisest and best of laws cannot reach and punish all wrongs; but that human society may exist men have to go further than human laws, and acknowledge, or *feign*, the existence of a God. Hence it follows that BELIEF in a God

is a real necessity to the life of society. Then, again, it must follow that Mr. Ingersoll in trying to destroy religious belief becomes an enemy of his race; and it is with him as with a foe to the interests of society that we have to do.

The most intelligent unbelievers have admitted the beneficence and necessity of religious belief. Voltaire says: "Religion is necessary in every fixed community. The laws are a curb upon open crimes, and religion upon those that are private."

Bolingbroke says: "The Gospel of Christ is one continued lesson of the strictest morality, justice, benevolence and universal charity. Supposing Christianity to have been purely a human invention, it has been the most amiable and useful invention that was ever imposed on mankind for their good."

Hume acknowledges that "The disbelief in a future state loosens the ties of morality in a great measure, and may for that reason be supposed pernicious to the peace of civil society."

Plutarch says: "There may be a city without foundations, rather than a state maintain itself without belief in gods." These words are as true to-day as they were two thousand years ago, and they are in perfect harmony with that eminent historian, James Anthony Froude, when he says: "Nations and individuals alike fall to ruin when they forget God." And that they *do* fall to ruin when they forget God, Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre and Troy and the empires that have gone down and are buried by the dust of ages, all bear mournful witness. But we need not hunt among ancient ruins for proof of the truth of this statement. Within the last hundred years the world has seen evidence enough of the ruin wrought by the influence of godless teachings. Take France for an example. Nearly one hundred years ago the eyes of the world were drawn toward that nation by the scenes enacted there. Another such a chapter of horrors can nowhere be found written in the book of time. It is known in history as the "Reign of Terror." A historian of to-day in speaking of the causes that led to those scenes of blood and rapine, says: "But if they had some real cause for this mad outbreak, it was also in part the result of false teachings. The age was infidel and godless. The tendencies of the public teachings of the philosophers, politicians and scholars of the day all tended to agrarianism, lawlessness and bloodshed."

These few words tell the whole story. The French, under the teaching of these godless leaders, had come to think that there was no use for a God, no need of any religion, and they concluded to abolish both. The experiment was not an entire success, as may be seen by an extract from a journal of the time, "The Eclair," which says: "We are the only people in the world that ever attempted to do without religion. But what is our sad experience? Every tenth day we are astounded by the recital of more crimes and assassinations than were committed formerly in a whole year. And at the risk of speaking an obsolete language, we declare that we must cease trying to destroy the remnants of religion if we desire to prevent the entire dissolution of

society." This lesson ought to be of value to us. Shall we be the *second* nation to do without religion? Yes, if we follow our Ingersolls. These philosophic Frenchmen closed the churches, imprisoned or murdered the ministers, and as far as possible, banished God and religion from the nation, under the belief that they were giving France something better; but instead of this they had, by removing religious restraints, turned loose the passions, appetites, lusts and selfishness of men, and a state of society resulted that was utterly beyond endurance.

Again in 1871 at the close of the war with Germany, France, or Paris, passed through another sea of blood, and again we have clear evidence that godlessness was the producing cause. The period is known as "Paris under the Commune," or the "Red Rebellion;" sometimes as the "Second Reign of Terror." Any attempt to follow this "Reign of Terror" in detail would take too much time and space, and though it might be very profitable reading it is not necessary; the only object being to show what men are ready to do as soon as they cast out God and religion, and to make plain the truth that those who would lead men to forget God are really most dangerous to society. - We can get at the real soul of the "Red Rebellion" by carefully studying their declaration or proclamation of the principles that were to govern under the new order of things. These were, first: A total denial of the existence of a God and a future State. Second: The prevention of any religious observances, and the treatment of ministers and priests as impostors. Third: The abolition of marriage, and the substitution of temporary connections to be dissolved at the will of either party. Fourth: The rearing of children by the Commune as in a vast foundling hospital, and the outlawry of all persons not living by the labor of their hands, and the appropriation of all property to public use.

Did human ingenuity and depravity ever devise anything better calculated to turn society up side down, and bring in the reign of anarchy, violence and terror? Very likely some friend of Ingersoll will say that it is not fair to class him with communists; that he believes in marriage and the rights of property, and all of that. Very well, we need not quarrel over that. It may be said of him, perhaps, as was said of another, that "He is the mildest mannered man that ever scuttled ship or cut a throat;" but is there a man anywhere who will stand up and say that Ingersoll's teachings do not tend to produce just such a state of things as existed under the Commune? Men are sometimes better than their beliefs; but these communists were worse, if possible, than their vile principles. They seemed to delight in atrocities; they murdered for the very love of murder; they tore down anything, everything, the more costly and valuable the better it seemed to suit them; and they erected their barricades, and behind them they fought God, Christianity and Society.

A New York Herald correspondent relates a conversation with Bergeyret, one of the leaders. The correspondent said to him: "You have no religion of course; but do you believe in the immortality of the soul?" "I believe in the immortality of the human mind, but not of the individual soul. We live, we grow up, we fall and die as the leaf, and return



to the dust from whence we came, and are immortal only in our children." "Do you believe in a God? "No." "Why?" "Because it is not republican. Because if there was a God he would be a tyrant. I fight God in the universe as I did the empire in France. If there were such a place as heaven, and I went there, and found a God, I would immediately commence throwing up barricades. I would hoist the red flag. I would rebel." Bergeret was not more atheistic than his fellows, and that they did not utterly destroy Paris was not because they lacked the will, but because they were overthrown before they could carry their plans into execution. The soldiers were ordered to charge their cannon with petroleum bombs, and to use wadding in their rifles dipped in petroleum; and they had devised plans for blowing the whole city into the air by placing explosives in the sewers, which were to be fired by electric wires. Only the suddenness of their overthrow prevented it.

Americans do surely know something of the evils that come along in the line of false *political* teachings. One man of commanding talents educated half of this great nation up (or down) to the belief of the right of secession, and I do not pretend to say that both leader and the led were not sincere; but whether sincere or not, it was a very costly job, and we cannot afford to forget its lessons—one of which is beware what you sow, for those who sow the wind are very likely to reap the whirlwind. Ingersoll is sowing the wind.

The communist, Bergeret, says: "God is a tyrant and I make war on him as on any other tyrant." Ingersoll says, "God is a tyrant, and I am trying to break the bonds that are binding men." At the infidel convention held in New York some years ago, one of its members, Dr. Shroder, said: "So long as man believes in God he is not free." These men, while using, as they naturally would, somewhat different forms of speech, seem to be in perfect accord as to belief, and this belief is God is a tyrant, man is a slave. And these men may be taken as representing the great atheistic, infidel, agnostic mob, or *church*, if they like that word better. Now what do these *abolitionists* mean by slavery? What do they mean by the liberty that they propose to give the world? Slavery means limitation, restraint, in greater or less degree. The physical universe is a wonderful, a stupendous system of slavery or restraint; or, which is the same thing, a system of law and order.

It is a law of physics, that all undisturbed motion is straight forward, and that a body projected into open space would continue to move in a right line, unless retarded or drawn out of its course by some external force. Suppose the present order of things should be changed for one hour, and that single law left to operate alone. Sun, moon, stars, the whole host of heaven, would start off in a right line all out of their orbits. What would be the result? Simply the destruction of the universe. But this force is not permitted to act alone; another power is brought to bear, a restraining, a conservative force. What is called the centripetal motion holds the other force in check, and as a result the star is not allowed to rush off into space, but is restrained, is *enslaved*, and is made to run in a given orbit. Every star is forced by this slavery to respect the rights of every other star, and as a consequence of this *slavery* we

have that wonderful, that beautiful harmony which pervades the physical universe. How it must vex the great soul of Ingersoll, as he reflects that all this is the work of the Great *Tyrant*; how very sad to think that he who succeeded so admirably in correcting the "Mistakes of Moses" cannot altogether correct the mistakes of the Maker.

Then it is *true*, in a sense, that the man who believes in a "God is not free." Christianity restrains men, or makes them slaves, if that suits Mr. Ingersoll better. "Men are not free" to murder, to commit adultery, to steal, to lie, to defraud, to get drunk; in fact not free to do anything wrong. Ingersoll wants to destroy Christianity, and give men liberty to commit all these crimes, and all the other sins that human passions, lusts and selfishness can suggest. It is because he is working to destroy all religious restraints that he becomes the mortal enemy of the best interests of society.

A story is told, and whether it is true or not it will serve to illustrate exactly the idea of freedom that Ingersoll wants to give the world. When he was in Milwaukee, there stood in his amen corner a lot of half drunken fellows. Ingersoll says: "I can prove there is no hell." One of the party staggered up to him and said: "Prove it Bob, prove it, as nine-tenths of us fellows here in Milwaukee are depending on how you make that out." The story is told as a good one on Milwaukee. Yes; but what a damning confirmation of the dangerous tendency of his teachings. There is no doubt that Milwaukee drunkards are very anxious to have Ingersoll prove that bible teachings are but fables, and every drunkard, everywhere, will hail him as a liberator; and not drunkards alone, but every murderer, thief, gambler, every liar, every prostitute, male or female, every man who wants to defraud his neighbor, every man who would oppress the widow or hireling, every man who is looking around to find some excuse for leaving the woman he has vowed to love and cherish, every woman that would prove false to the marriage covenant; all find aid, comfort, encouragement, when Ingersoll tells them there is no danger of their being called to account by and by.

But is there a man anywhere who believes in truth, honor, honesty, sobriety, law and order, who does not see the corrupting tendency of all such teachings? It does not *seem* possible. Would you put a teacher into your school with the belief that he would at every favorable opportunity fill the minds of your children with Ingersollism? It is not likely there is a board of directors in the land stupid enough for this. Why did not those who had charge of the business erect their works and pump water from Chicago river to supply the city? Do you go into the market and buy for the use of your family diseased meat and decaying vegetables? Why not? Do men (sane, intelligent men) build their houses close down to cess pools and marshes? And is the filth of Chicago river, and the exhalations from the Pontine marshes more fatal to physical life and health than Ingersoll is to moral health?

Suppose this mischievous genius should for the sake of variety go before the public with most outrageously obscene, vulgar discourses, how long would he be tolerated? Yet all the evil he could do in that direc-

tion would be as one hour to a thousand years compared with what he is doing.

A few weeks ago there was a convention of Freethinkers at Albany, which was addressed by Mr. Ingersoll. In the course of his remarks he said: "Most people imagine that belief is very important, that if you don't believe in a certain form of religion it is because you want to steal something, that you like to eat your own child, or commit some fearful crime; and yet it seems to me that *religious belief* never had much effect in making people good." This language is quite characteristic and is worthy of note. It may be said of it, fairly, there is not one true sentence or sentiment in it. Indeed, it seems utterly impossible for Ingersoll to state a point fairly. Perhaps this is the result of inherent dishonesty; certain it is that long practice has made him an expert in false statement. It is hardly possible to get more absurdity and falsity into one short sentence than this—"It seems to me that religious belief never had much to do in making people good." This is just equivalent to saying that belief is neither a power for good or evil. Now if we touch this statement at any point, its absurdity and falsity will appear. What caused the war of the rebellion? BELIEFS. The South *believed* in slavery; they *believed* that the relation of master and slave was the best that could exist between the races; they *believed* the North was not dealing fairly by them; they *believed* in state rights; they *believed* in secession. The North also had *beliefs*. They *believed* human slavery wrong, a disgrace to the Nation and age; they *believed* that it should be restricted; they *believed* this was a Nation, and they *believed* in fighting for its life. Talk about there being no power in belief! Why it is true, and will remain so for ever, "That as a man *believeth* in his heart, so is he."

Take one case only of individual belief. A murderer standing on the scaffold said "I am guilty, doubly guilty. I have no apology and no regret. I have sought pleasure to the utmost at every sense. I have satiated every appetite, and gratified without limit every passion. I have done it deliberately and understandingly, for I *believe* there is nothing beyond the grave, and therefore no judgment, and no hell." This believer is commended to Ingersoll's notice, particularly because he is engaged in delivering men from *bondage*, and making of them just such kind of *freemen* as this.

A few days after saying that religious belief was of no power for good, Ingersoll was talking at Cleveland, and among other things said: "I don't want to be taxed to support the Catholic church, for I think it is an unadulterated evil." Oh, you do think it unadulterated evil, do you? Well, if that church is an evil, greater or less, it surely is because it has certain *beliefs* and certain practices growing out of them. But you said at Albany that religious beliefs had never much power to make men *good*. The thought then, in its last analysis, is: Religious belief is all powerful for evil; all powerless for good. Is not that rather a large sized *bull* for Pope Bob I; and it is not one of the kind that Popes usually make either, but rather belongs to the Irish breed. Evidently Ingersoll remembers Father Lambert. When the sores on his back get well he may be able to see some good in the Catholic church.



In passing, it may be well to warn Ingersoll that some of the younger members of his flock are not quite sound in the faith. A very highly inflated young agnostic said to me, "I believe religion is good for women and niggers." This will never do; there is danger in such an admission. One step further and some one will say that religion *may* be good for very weak men in certain cases. These lambs must be looked after. Pope Bob should hasten to issue an encyclical, warning young disciples against *heresies*. Mr. Ingersoll's anxiety to belittle religious belief, and to make it appear to be an influence of no value, comes perhaps from this fact: If he should for once acknowledge the manifest truth that religious belief is the greatest power that touches or can touch men; and as he finds himself trying to destroy that belief then he must see himself as he really is, a freebooter, carrying the piratical flag, making war on the moral commerce of the world and endangering the institutions of society. This may not trouble him greatly, for "*Di grand eloquenza, picciola coscienza*," great eloquence, little conscience, seems to be fully exemplified in his case. If Ingersoll should become a thoroughly conscientious man, this would very likely get an experience and confession similar, in some respects, to one related in my hearing some time ago. The relator said: "I commenced preaching in a large eastern city. I saw, could not help seeing, the sin and suffering in the world, and wanted to do something to turn men from one and save them from the other. I had a very good opinion of human nature; did not believe in the depravity of the race at all; did not believe in penalties in the beyond; and, of course, did not preach them; thought that what men needed were smoother teachings. I was successful in drawing large audiences. I worked hard, time passed, people listened attentively, but I was not quite satisfied with results. I did not seem to be doing them any real good. I worked harder. They came, listened, paid me and went along. I grew more and more dissatisfied. There was no less evil so far as I could see. Nobody seemed to *think* even of forsaking any particular form of sinning. One night, after preaching, I mixed with the crowd as they went in the darkness home. I could not help hearing some of the remarks upon the sermon. One said 'That was a fine discourse, wasn't it.' " The compliment did not please him. He grew thoughtful. Had he made a mistake? After all, were these "fine sermons" just what were needed? He worked, if possible, harder still. The people came in flocks, treated him respectfully, paid liberally, and went right along with their deviltry. He could not stand it. Discouraged and disgusted, he gave up; came West and settled on a farm, where he was living at the time of this relation.

If the time ever comes when Ingersoll shall love men as well as he loves their money, then we may find him on the stool of repentance and confession.

Mr. Ingersoll's teachings in their practical bearings touch us at every vital point, and their touch is like that of the samiel. Thoughtful men find cause for alarm in the fact that the marriage relation, which has been regarded as the sacred cement binding society together, is seemingly losing its conservative power. Divorces are applied for and

granted with an increasing freeality. It is said there are six hundred divorce cases pending in the courts of Chicago alone. Is it any wonder that a writer in the Century says: "The more the statistics of divorce are studied and understood, the more alarming seems the situation." No one can fairly call in question the truth of this statement; but when the writer says, "the institution of marriage suffers on the one hand from the cynic and on the other from the sentimentalist," it becomes evident that he utterly fails to see the real difficulty. Probably there are no more, no less, cynics and sentimentalists than there were fifty or one hundred years ago, while divorces have increased an hundred fold. Every man who would not see society utterly dissolved and given over to the free lovers ought to give thought to the causes that are at work to produce this state of things. Look again at Paris and see just what men will do when they cast off God and religion. Note the order. No God. No Religion. No Marriage. No Property. And note this fact, too, that men can *never* come to be free lovers and communists without first rejecting God and Christianity. Another fact, and this is the one with which we have to do mainly: Mr. Ingersoll is doing all in his power to make men Godless; Christless, and is thus doing all in his power to destroy the marriage relation and the rights of property. The wife of a free lover says: "We don't believe in a God," and she regretted that Victoria Woodhull was not nominated for the Presidency in 1872. The sum in this: When a man or a woman is fully divorced from God and Christianity it is very easy for them to become divorced from each other.

And the same may be said in regard to the rights of property. Get rid of God and Christianity and all the rest is easy. Some years ago Prince Napoleon gave a dinner to a number of notable freethinkers of Paris, at which a vast deal of religious and irreligious discussion took place, and finally it was proposed to vote on the question, "Is there a God." Seven votes were cast, six noes and one blank. Among the voters was Mr. Proudhon, the famous author of the formula, "All Property is Theft." Look at this formula the second time and see just what this godless Frenchman means. He means that every man who has by patient industry, temperance and prudence saved more or less property is a thief and should be made to divide with the lazy, shiftless and vicious. Such teachings and beliefs are *possible* where God and Christianity are ignored and scoffed at, but never where Christianity holds control with human minds.

Very likely it will be said there is no danger in our own country; but there *is* danger. There is no more hopeful field on which to sow communistic seed than our own land. You say that the laws protect every man in his rights of property. Yes, but who and what protects the laws? We have them because public sentiment is christian. But suppose Ingersoll and such as he finally succeed in making this a godless instead of a christian nation. Majorities rule here, and a large majority of the voters will always be poor or comparatively poor men. Then what will there be to prevent them from making Mr. Proudhon's "All Property is Theft" the law of the State or Nation?

That convention of infidels that met at Cleveland the other day, of

which Mr. Ingersoll was president, said they wanted to "secularize the government." Just what they want and how much of it one can hardly tell. They seemed to be in much the same frame of mind that the drunken Dutchman was when he said, "I want to kill somebody." So these fellows wanted to do something to somebody. They would denationalize all religion if they could; probably they would shut up or burn up all churches; they would drive all chaplains from congress and the state legislatures, from penitentiaries, from every place. A christian prayer at a funeral they would consider as so much nonsense, probably. They would not have any officer, upon assuming the duties of his place, recognize a God in any oath; neither would they have jury or witness acknowledge God in an oath. In fact, it is fair to presume that their object is to hasten the time when God shall not be in the thought of any human being. Is there a really sane patriotic man who wants to see such a state of society? We complain that men are false to high official trust committed to them. Are we likely to find men more faithful and honest when God is outlawed?

Among the last words of one of the wisest earthly rulers were these: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." This is very old fashioned teaching, to be sure; but is it certain that the world has no use for it to-day? In the life of this nation there was never a time when practical christianity was more needed than now. Never a time when the enemies of religion were more surely the enemies of society. All thoughtful men see the peril there is in the controversy between labor and capital. The parties are standing off and eyeing each other as mortal foes. And what is the *real* difficulty? Just one word will answer this question, and that one word is *selfishness*. And as one word stands for the disease, so one word stands for a perfect cure, and *that* word is CHRISTIANITY. Apply the Golden Rule to the case. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." I do respectfully ask Mr. Ingersoll, or any of his admirers, to answer fairly, would the application of this rule cut the whole quarrel up by the roots, and at once cure the evil, and remove all danger? There *can* be but one answer to this. This rule is equally good everywhere. It is the unfailing cure for human selfishness.

At the very beginning of work in the new congress Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, introduced a bill to promote peace among nations. The bill authorizes the President to enter into negotiations with other nations, the object being to form an international tribunal for the arbitration of any difficulties that may arise among nations, and the President is requested to invite other nations to send delegates to a peace convention to be held at Washington at such time as he may fix, and making an appropriation of \$150,000 for such purpose. That is practical christianity. "Blessed be the peace makers," and if there were more *real*, rather than nominal christians in congress, this bill would soon pass, and other nations moved by a like spirit would send their delegates, and war would be made an outlaw, and the hosts of men now carrying arms and studying the most approved methods of killing might turn to the arts of peace. Christianity would not only bring peace to the nations, but



would bring peace to neighborhoods and families. It would make every man a good husband, father, son, brother, neighbor, citizen; every woman a good wife, mother, daughter, sister.

Again I quote that eminent infidel Bolingbroke: "The gospel of Christ is one continued lesson of the strictest morality, justice, benevolence, and universal charity." And this is the gospel that Ingersoll would trample in the dust. This is the gospel that he wants to make an outlaw. Verily, this man is "the enemy of the human race." He claims to be wiser than the ancients, but what foundation is there for such claim? Can his admirers point to one single sentence of his that is likely to enter into the literature or thought of the world, and be often quoted as a wise saying? If every word that he has ever written and spoken was forgotten, utterly wiped out from memory, would any living soul be the poorer for it? There is no lack of effrontery; of audacity there is enough; more than enough of shocking irreverence and blasphemy. Pope's lines,

"Where wit fails, pride steps in to their defence,  
And fills up all the mighty void of sense,"

to exactly apply to the latitude and longitude of Ingersoll, should be read thus:

"Where wisdom fails, cheek comes to his defence,  
And he mistakes brass for common sense."

He claims to be an agnostic, or know-nothing, and it is plain that he is *all* of that. Yet he is so dogmatic that he has earned the name of Pope. Probably he is the only man who has lived that had the unbounded and abounding self conceit that enabled him to say that he could make a better bible than the christian bible. We look at him as at the Amazon; he has no peer. He is like Saul, only his self conceit makes him not only head and shoulders taller than all others, but just think of his immense *weight*. Why, in all the on coming years, he will be referred to as the Agnostic Jumbo.

But seriously is not this self conceit very unbecoming and very disgusting? How nicely he must be fitted for bible making. The natural bent of his mind and the training he has had in trying to deceive courts and juries; all go to show that "he is *the* man." Now, in view of the fact that he does not *even pretend to know* anything about christianity, would not a modicum of modesty be rather a becoming ornament for him to carry about with him? The proverb says: "A wise woman buildeth her house, but a foolish one plucketh it down with her hands." One of these foolish women once said to Lord Chesterfield, "My lord, I have always thought that the members of parliament were a very intelligent body of men." "Well madam, they are supposed to be rather intelligent," said Chesterfield. "Then why don't they try and put down the bible," she said. "I presume they will do so just as soon as there is a better bible made," was the sensible and rather settling answer of Chesterfield. Mr. Ingersoll began at the same end of the work that this



woman did; he commenced to pluck down the old house before he had a single board, nail or shingle for the new house. And so the proverb, and common sense, and prudence, place him with the foolish ones.

Blind Sampson grasped the pillars on which the temple rested, and bowing himself with all his might, said "Let me die with the Philistines." So Mr. Ingersoll would grasp God and Religion, the pillars that support all the best interests of society, and tear all down in hopeless ruin.

When the time comes that this Chance or Accident, Nothing or Nobody, that gave us these bodies shall so transform them that putrid meat and decayed and decaying vegetables, fruits and grains shall be wholesome food; when men shall drink at cesspools and sewers, and have good bodily health, then may we expect that the same Nobody will so transform our mental and moral natures that Ingersoll's teachings will not be poison to individuals and dangerous to society. Never before.

When Aaron Burr died it was said that earth had taken to her bosom the worst man that America ever saw. Endowed, as he surely was, with a high order of talents, this man is hardly remembered, is almost forgotten by his countrymen. But his name shall not perish from the earth. Oh, no! but in the long living annals of infamy Burr shall have a place, and when all remembrance of his mental gifts shall have faded from all minds yet shall the memory of his vices live.

Without being personally corrupt, as was Burr, Mr. Ingersoll is beyond all comparison a worse man for his country. While Burr debauched individuals, Ingersoll would corrupt his country and the world. Candid infidels have in all ages, without entering the inner temple of christianity, been led to admire the outer sanctuary. The wonderful teachings of the bible have ever been viewed with awe and reverence. Mr. Ingersoll finds in them only subjects for savage criticism, and coarser witticism. For all religious beliefs, those things nearest and dearest to human souls, he seems to have about as much respect as an old libertine has for female virtue. He gets as much fun out of a discussion of the problems of life, death and eternity as he could out of a case of assault and battery before a justice of the peace. Where the wisest men of all ages have walked reverently, and with upturned eyes, saying: "What I know not, teach thou me," Ingersoll, with a self conceit that no line can ever fathom, turns his eyes inwardly and finds there a supply of wisdom. Professing to point out the highway of liberty, his teachings lead to a state of bondage the most abject, the most crushing, the slavery of sin. Happy will it be for the youth of America if they shall be able to estimate Ingersoll at his *real* value; if they shall see clearly that shocking irreverence, unbounded audacity, measureless self conceit, are not qualities belonging to first-rate minds, and shall turn away from him. Fortunate will it be for his countrymen if the influence of his teachings shall be buried with his body. Thrice happy if they shall lay to heart this truth: "Nations and individuals alike fall to ruin when they forget God."

And finally, without permitting sectarianism, or bigotry, passion or prejudice to testify in this case, we must allow impartial history and the wisest men of all times to give evidence, and the sum of this evidence is this: *Religious belief is a necessity to the very life of civilized society.* Hence as Mr. Ingersoll is striving to destroy religious belief, the verdict against him *must* be

HOSTIS HUMANI GENERIS.

(An enemy of the human race.)

---

NOTE BY THE PRINTER.—In the interview on the 7th page with the retired clergyman a profane expletive was associated with the “fine discourse” alluded to, but was omitted by the compositor and not corrected in the proof. The omission of this expletive, “d—d,” obscures the point made by the writer. The reader, however, can supply it.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 898 620 1